

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 21 are pending. Claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 – 16, 20 and 21 are rejected. Claims 4, 7, 10, 17, 18 and 19 are objected to.

The applicant's attorney amends claims 1, 5, 7 and 12, and adds claims 23 – 27. Claim 7 has been amended not to overcome the examiner's objection, but to conform it to its respective, corresponding independent claim 5, as amended. Claim 22 is an independent form of dependent claim 4, which contains allowable subject matter. Claims 23 and 24 are independent forms of dependent claims 7 and 10, respectively, which contain allowable subject matter. Claims 25, 26 and 27 are independent forms of dependent claims 17, 18 and 19, respectively, which contain allowable subject matter. The applicant's attorney respectfully asserts that claims 1 – 27, as amended, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed below.

If, after considering this response, the examiner believes the claims should not be allowed, the applicants' attorney respectfully requests that before issuing an Office Action, the examiner call Mr. John Janeway (425-455- 5575) to schedule a telephone conference to further the prosecution of the claims.

Claims 1 – 4

The applicant's claim 1, as amended, recites a hull having at least three operating modes wherein the at least three operating modes includes a SWATH mode.

The applicant's attorney respectfully asserts that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over U.S. Patent 5, 967,072 (Leary) at least because Leary fails to disclose a SWATH operating mode.

Claims 2 – 4 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1, as amended.

Rejection of Claims 5 – 11

Claim 5, as amended, is patentable over Leary at least for the reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1, as amended, over Leary.

Claims 6 – 11, as amended, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 5, as amended.

Rejection of Claims 12 – 21

Claim 12, as amended, is patentable over Leary at least for reasons similar to those recited above in support of claim 1, as amended, over Leary.

Claims 13 – 21 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 12, as amended.

Conclusion

The applicant's attorney respectfully requests the examiner withdraw the rejection against claims 1 – 21 and issue an allowance for claims 1 – 27.

If, after considering this response, the examiner believes the claims should not be allowed, the applicants' attorney respectfully requests that before issuing an Office Action, the examiner call Mr. John Janeway (425-455- 5575) to schedule a telephone conference to further the prosecution of the claims.

DATED this 12th day of December 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
GRAYBEAL JACKSON HALEY LLP

John M. Janeway
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,796
155-108th Avenue N.E., Ste. 350
Bellevue, WA 98004-5973
(425) 455-5575